Spectral geographies:

haunting and everyday state practices in colonial and present-day Alaska

ABSTRACT

Haunting is an analytic that foregrounds connections between the past and the present-day. I employ haunting to analyze everyday practices of the colonial state in Alaska, thereby reinforcing the material connections between everyday activities and narratives and the imaginaries they create, questioning the timeless character of many studies of everyday geographies, and demanding attention to justice. A case study from Alaska involving federal non-recognition of the Qutekcak tribe demonstrates connections between colonial histories and present-day practices of the state, connections that take shape as a "spectral geography."

Keywords: haunting, everyday state practices, spectral geographies, colonialism, Alaska

INTRODUCTION

On October 2, 1998, Representative Don Young, a Republican of Alaska, introduced H. R. 4693, a bill that would grant Federal recognition to the Qutekcak Native Tribe of Alaska and the Tuscarora Nation in North Carolina (Young 1998). The bill argued that long-standing tribal ties to ancestral homelands and continuing patterns of traditional land use justified recognition from the Federal government, a change in tribal status that would allow tribes to represent Native residents, access compensation from the Federal government, and participate in legislation such as the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of

1988 (Nazzaro 2006). As the Qutekcak tribe's website states, "the designation also allows us to proceed with self-governance, advocate for our tribal needs and establish a government-to-government relationship" (Qutekcak Native Tribe 2010). H. R. 4693 did not advance out of the House of Representatives in 1998, despite Representative Young's efforts. It proved to be another unsuccessful attempt to obtain sovereign recognition for the Qutekcak tribe.

Young's 1998 bill was a response to the Qutekcak tribe's continuing struggles to obtain Federal recognition, a complicated history that is the empirical basis for this analysis. The particular Russian and American colonial state practices that influenced the history of the Qutekcak tribe from the late 1700s until the mid-twentieth century has shaped the experiences of the present-day Qutekcak tribal members. Colonial history, in this case, manifests itself as an active, purposeful, and often-malevolent presence in current tribal struggles. The infiltration of the colonial state into everyday life occurred in the past through ordinary practices such as intimate relationships and disease control, yet these everyday state practices profoundly shaped present-day tribal issues.

In this paper, I argue for a reinterpretation of colonial state practices and their resonance in the present-day through the analytic of haunting. Haunting, I suggest, reinforces the idea that practices construct what we consider to be the state, and demands attention to the history and context of these practices. Furthermore, haunting draws attention to issues of justice. Not only can haunting help us better construct, situate, and ethically consider the everyday practices of the state, but this analytic also connects ideas and events that at first appear unrelated. Interpreting disparate events as hauntings, part

of larger patterns or spectral geographies of colonial injustice, allows us to better contemplate the continued colonial contradictions embedded in the present-day.

The paper proceeds as follows. First, I narrate the empirical case study, which draws from two months of fieldwork in Seward, Alaska in 2008. I conducted 45 hour length semi-structured interviews about community and federal politics with both Native and non-Native residents of Seward. I also conducted archival research at the University of Alaska, Anchorage. I met with the Qutekcak administration and Elder's group, and while that experience prompted the investigation into public records, newspaper articles, federal legislation, and Native history on which this analysis is based, my communication with tribal Elders is only mentioned regarding general community history because of privacy concerns. This paper does not represent the Qutekcak tribe's interpretation of events, although tribal administrators have viewed drafts of the analysis.

The story of the Qutekcak underlies the central theme of the paper, the development of haunting as an analytic useful for studies of social and cultural geography, especially in areas such as Alaska where the line between postcolonial and colonial tends to blur. Theories of haunting are accessed through an understanding of the state that emphasizes its construction through repeated and embodied ordinary practices. The connections between colonial histories and present-day practices of the state take shape as a "spectral geography." Spectral geographies help us to grasp how the contradictions of colonialism continue and become manifested in the present, yet suggest that these colonial ghosts are contestable as well: "to learn to live with ghosts," as Jacques Derrida (1994: xviii) writes, is not necessarily a life sentence.

STRUGGLES FOR SOVEREIGN RECOGNITION

For the past several decades, the Qutekcak tribe, headquartered in Seward, Alaska, has struggled to obtain U.S. federal recognition of its sovereignty. This analysis does not attempt to weigh whether the tribe *should* receive federal recognition, but instead investigates the processes through which its attempts at obtaining recognition have been thwarted in the past. As a federally non-recognized tribal organization, the Qutekcak tribe has limited legal authority to represent Seward's Native residents and access the additional funds. Yet the Qutekcak tribe's perceived legitimacy relies on policies determined by the U.S. government.

In 1978, the U.S. established seven mandatory criteria that tribes must fulfill for recognition, which include proving that a tribe has existed "on a continuous basis" and "predominantly as a community" since 1900. The tribal structure must have maintained "political influence or authority over members" throughout its history, and members must provide governing documents to back up their claim. In addition, a tribe must also show that members descend from a tribe or tribes that functioned as a "political entity," and ensure that there exists no legislation barring their recognition on the Federal level (Murphy 2005). Of these criteria, the one proving most burdensome to the Qutekcak was proving their continuous existence as a community since 1900.

The Qutekcak tribe is small, with only around two hundred members. Today, the Qutekcak tribal organization provides programs, support, and social services for members, especially for youth and elders (Allen 2011). Tribal affairs are governed by a seven-member Tribal Council, and administered by a six-person staff at the Qutekcak Native Tribe office in Seward (Allen 2011). The tribe has been politically active on a state and Federal

level since the 1960s, when members founded the Chugach Native Association, and later the Mount Marathon Native Association.

Attempts to obtain federal recognition began when the Qutekcak were not officially listed in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) of 1971 (Chugachimuit 2008). Qualifying Natives, according to ANCSA, meant persons of *previously* certified Native heritage, who had one-fourth or more Alaskan Indian, Eskimo, or Aleut blood (Ongtooguk 2004). ANCSA relied on preexisting definitions of Native residents, most of which were certified as Native under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, amended in 1936 (Alaska Division of Commerce 2003). Because of the particular historical circumstances surrounding their formation, as I will detail below, the Qutekcak had not been defined as a tribal community prior to 1934, and therefore were left out of the 1971 legislation. (Qutekcak Native Tribe 2010). Over the past ten years, the Qutekcak Tribal Organization has pursued two concurrent strategies towards achieving federal recognition despite this obstacle: one bypasses the seven criteria by obtaining recognition through the U.S. Congress (attempted by Representative Young in 1998), the other follows the seven requirements by establishing the other six criteria for recognition and contesting the applicability of the seventh (Young 1998). In 2002, the Qutekcak submitted the first step in the seven-requirement process, but the Bureau of Indian Administration has been slow to review claims (The Wave 2009). Local government authorities endorsed the Qutekcak's efforts in 2007 and 2008 (Seward City News 2007; Kenai Peninsula Borough 2008).

Despite this dual strategy, for many years, attempts by the Qutekcak to receive federal recognition have been unsuccessful. Obtaining recognition requires contending not only with state bureaucracy and Federal criteria, but also with ghosts from Alaska's

colonial past. Russian and American colonial state practices resulted in the fragmentation of the Native population living in the Seward area. In 1799, the Russian state permitted the Russian American Company to harvest furs in Alaska (Haycox 2002). While formal Russian colonization did not occur until the 1840s, the Russian American Company and its use of forced Native labor established colonial state influence on life along the Kenai Peninsula (Haycox 2002: 54).

Resettlement occurred before formal colonization of the peninsula. However, because the Russian government sanctioned the activities of the Russian American Company, its practices were nevertheless *colonial* practices. Similar to how the East India Company implemented British colonial practices on the ground (see e.g. Lloyd 2008), the Russian American Company performed the everyday work of the colonial state in nineteenth century Alaska. The Russian presence in Alaska was sparse—the largest number of Russians ever to live in Alaska at any given time was 823; yet their interactions with Alaskan Natives reshaped settlement on the southwestern coast (Haycox 2002: 89). The Unegkurmiut occupied settlements along the coast near present-day Seward until the 1880s, but these Native populations moved to the opposite side of the peninsula because of forced labor practices that supported consolidating fur and coal mining industries, as well as the desire of the Russian Orthodox Church to minister to Native people more frequently (Crowell and Mann 1998; Stanek 1998). By 1880, the last known Native settlement adjacent to the present-day City of Seward was abandoned (Crowell et al. 2008).

Colonial practices were not limited to the dispersal of Native residents from the Seward area—they also explain how some Native Alaskans reestablished a Native presence in Seward. Many older Native residents moved to Seward after it became the site of the

Jesse Lee Home, a Methodist Church orphanage for children. The institution was founded in Unalaska in 1890, targeting, as Captain M.A. Healy wrote in 1892, the "whole Western end of the Territory where there are numbers of children and poor waifs, many the offspring of white fathers, growing up without the care of homes or the education and training of Christian parents" (in Barry 1995: 60). Both the Russian and American colonial projects in Alaska involved a deeply unequal gendered and sexual relationship between (primarily) white men and indigenous women, a relationship that created mixed-race children who literally embodied colonial state practices of exploration, contact, and gendered power imbalances (Haycox 2002). Orphanages became the method through which Alaskan territorial settlers dealt with mixed-race children. Children who arrived at the Jesse Lee Home were often, although not always, orphaned by one or both parents, many from diseases exacerbated by increased contact between Native Alaskans and white settlers (Barry 1995: 61; Cook 1973). In 1925, the Methodists moved the orphanage to Seward's newly constructed Jesse Lee Home. Until the 1964 earthquake, the Home was instrumental in bringing Native people from all over Alaska to Seward, where they often stayed (Barry 1995: 62).

In 1946, a Methodist-operated tuberculosis sanatorium brought more Native Alaskans to Seward. The territory's purchase of Fort Raymond from the US military in 1945 was part of a long history of federal and territorial state attention towards tuberculosis in Alaska. Like in other parts of the world, control of disease was one manifestation of biopolitical colonial projects (e.g. Manderson 1999; Nally 2008). In Alaska, part of the state focus on tuberculosis stemmed from its widespread nature: a 1940s survey showed that three quarters of children in the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta had tuberculosis (Alaska History

2010). Furthermore, the disease proved deadly: the death rate from tuberculosis in Southeast Alaska compared to the rest of the U.S. was 1,302 vs. 56 per 100,000 in 1932 (Alaska History 2010). Governor John G. Brady directed federal attention to the disease in 1901, noting that, "it would be a gracious thing for the Government to step in and assist [Native Alaskans] to combat this deadly malady" (in Fortuine 2005: 15). The Bureau of Education, as the largest federal bureaucracy in territorial Alaska, began building hospitals, hiring physicians, and tasking teachers with conducting house-by-house inspections to certify Native Alaskans' control over cleanliness, spitting, and ventilation (Fortuine 2005: 29). After 1943, the surplus military property in Alaska finally allowed for a sufficient supply of potential beds. The Seward Sanatorium was the first surplus military property to become a hospital, and housed primarily Native Alaskans. By the 1950s, however, new tuberculosis drugs made sanatorium treatment obsolete, and the Seward Sanatorium closed in 1958 (Barry 1995). Many former patients, however, stayed, and together with the former orphanage residents, became the foundation of a new Native Alaskan population in Seward.

The fragmentation of the Seward Native population in the era of Russian colonization, as well as the presence of institutions such as the Jesse Lee Home and the "San," demonstrate how colonial practices—forced resettlement, sexual encounters, transmission of diseases, and new forms of mobility—changed the composition and geography of Seward's Native community and continue to influence the struggle for Qutekcak sovereignty. Russian colonial state practices were directly involved in the relocation of Seward-area Native Alaskans. The diseases and mixed-race children who inspired the construction of the Sanatorium and Jesse Lee Home were also the focus of

biopolitical state projects to contain the results of encounters—through disease transmission or conceiving children—between Native Alaskans and settlers. The colonial state practices that resulted in the fragmentation and post-1900 reconsolidation of the Native population in Seward continue to shape present-day negotiations over sovereignty.

Asking whether the Qutekcak existed "on a continuous basis" in Seward since 1900, as the U.S. law necessitates, requires acknowledging that they were *explicitly prevented from doing so* because of Russian and U.S. state activities. What kind of community of Native residents could have existed "predominantly as a community" when colonial practices of dispersal and fragmentation worked against such a community ever forming? In the remainder of the paper, I explore an analytical framework for understanding how colonial state practices shape present-day Qutekcak struggles for sovereign recognition.

HAUNTING AS AN ANALYTIC

Geographers and other scholars have proposed a variety of ways to understand the continued resonance of colonial state practices in the present-day (for recent discussion in *Social and Cultural Geography* alone, for example, see Fraser 2007; Kearney and Bradley 2009; Power and Sidaway 2005; and Smiley 2010). Colonization has framed our understandings of the lives of Russian fur traders and mobile Native Alaskans; it acted, as Stephen Sleman writes, as a continuous process beginning with the "moment that the colonizing power inscribes itself onto the body and space of its Others" (cited in Sidaway 2000: 594). Yet what becomes important in cases like the Qutekcak is not *that* the tribe finds it nearly impossible to achieve recognition, but *how it is such that* these circumstances become taken for granted. It is that erasure, that larger injustice, that prompted me to turn to Sociologist Avery Gordon's theories of haunting. She (2008: 7-8) uses the term haunting

to refer to occasions when "that which appears to be not there is often a seething presence, acting on and often meddling with taken-for-granted realities." Haunting is an analytic which illuminates specific aspects of social life: aspects which *appear to be not there*, concealed yet important; aspects which *seethe, acting on* or *meddling with* present-day realities in a violent or disturbed manner; and finally, aspects that by seething, unsettle taken-for-granted realities. Haunting is not a value-neutral term: it highlights histories that cannot rest. As a metaphor to understand individual projects of recovery or giving 'voice' to the unheard, haunting may be problematic, especially in cases where the voices of colonized peoples are re-colonized through the appropriation of their speech (see Cameron 2008). Yet as an *analytic* to frame state practices, it allows scholars to engage with the continued resonance of the past in the present.

Many scholars have attempted to address the continued relevance of the colonial past in present-day lives, practices, and institutions. For example, Derek Gregory (2004: 9) writes that the task of postcolonialism is to "recover the dead weight of colonialism: to retrieve its shapes, like the chalk outlines at a crime scene, and to recall the living bodies they so imperfectly summon to presence." Postcolonialism remembers and recovers yet avoids nostalgia. Ann Stoler (2008) emphasizes colonial practices as active and ongoing. She (2008: 196) writes about "ruins of empire," highlighting "their reappropriations and strategic and active positioning within the politics of the present." Stoler's (2008: 194) ruins can be reactivated in the present: their presence in the material, emotional, and psychological landscape prompts the continued "ruination" of people's lives in the present. Her attention to the ongoing nature of colonial positioning attends closely to Sleman's *continuing* process of inscription, yet haunting pushes the terms of inquiry one step further.

Haunting recognizes the material, purposeful, active, and unjust nature of the colonial experience. Ghosts have material and metaphorical effects. Ghosts are "seething presences" which create present-day injustices (Gordon 2008: 8). In contrast to Stoler's ruins, which focus on "what people are 'left with,'" or what Bruce Braun (2002) calls the "afterlife" of colonialism, haunting forces attention to elements of the colonial past as active elements of the present. The effectiveness of haunting comes from its inextricable connection with justice, and its focus on the continued activity, or the seething presence of ghosts in present-day practices. To summarize, haunting is (1) material; (2) active and effective in the present; and (3) concerned with justice.

Geographers have responded to Roger Luckhurst's (2003) argument that social science is undergoing a "spectral turn." For example, a recent editorial in *Cultural Geographies* noted that, "careful attunement to the ghostly, spectral and the absent, can be a particularly powerful and emancipatory way of dealing with a number of problematics central to contemporary geographical thought" (Maddern and Adey 2008). Ghosts are often deployed as metaphors (Hamidi 2009; Jansson 2007) or incorporated into forgotten histories (Edensor 2008; Wylie 2009), much like Gregory's project of filling in the chalk outlines. For other scholars (Cameron 2008; McEwan 2008) ghosts act like Stoler's ruins, as pieces of the past repositioned in the present. Few geographers have treated ghosts as a historical reality beyond a metaphor, but one exception is Joshua Comaroff's (2007) exploration of the "ghostly topographies" of Singapore, where rumors of ghosts disrupt construction projects, diminish property values, and contest the control of biopolitical projects over the "politics of death." Comaroff's attention to property values and

interrupted building projects demonstrates the possibility of understanding ghosts as practical meddlers in landscapes of justice, politics, and power.

EVERYDAY STATE PRACTICES AS SITE

I look to the everyday practices of the state to encounter the "seething presence" (Gordon 2008: 8) of ghosts. The concept of 'the state' has been highly contested across the social sciences (Abrams 2006; Mountz 2004; Peck 2003). Geographers are retreating from imagining states as bounded territories (Agnew 2005) and embracing instead ideas of state practices that blur its boundaries (Gupta 2006; Mountz 2004). Is 'the state' something material, or better understood as an idea or an effect? In this analysis, I employ James Ferguson's (2006: 282) understanding of the state as the "a kind of knotting or congealing of power," a construction of practices and power relations operating at various scales. This definition underscores the status of 'the' state as a construction rather than an entity; however, it also requires an investigation into how the impression of an entity nevertheless becomes constructed (Aretxaga 2003). I situate the many divergent practices of state-construction in colonial Alaska, including the intimate relationships and technologies of disease control in Seward, within this *process* of constructing the effect of a singular state.

One method by which geographers have focused on the construction of the state is by employing the notion of the everyday. Despite the careful scholarship that strives to define, locate, and explore the possibilities of the everyday (see e.g. *Cultural Studies, 18(2/3)*) it is easy to assume that the everyday means the same thing to everyone. Yet important differences underscore the variable uses of the term. Like others (e.g. Secor 2007; Thrift 2004) have noted, the everyday need not imply the unexceptional or

uncritically authentic. Instead, by encompassing the social relations that people perform on a daily basis (Garmany 2009), the study of the everyday creates a space of analysis where "abstractions… must eventually land" (Gregg 2004: 365).

A key aspect of the everyday is the notion of repetition. Repetition is for many scholars (e.g. Bhatti et al 2009; Garmany 2009) the most important characteristic of the everyday: it is that which happens again and again, and often for that reason is assumed to be unimportant. Theorists of the state, however, draw on this notion of daily repetition to illuminate how practices and (extra)ordinary encounters serve to construct an impression of coherence, of a single 'state' at work (Mountz 2003; Secor 2007). The everyday is the *location* where people actually perform the state (Painter 2006). While state practices differ from day to day and person to person, repetition creates effects of stability and permanence.

A second important element of the everyday draws from feminist work on social reproduction and embodied daily practices (Dyck 2005; Smith 1987). The everyday represents not only the activities that make up our lived experiences (Painter 2006) but it also encompasses the embodied nature of these practices (Bissell 2009; Mountz 2003). It is only through their *embodied* aspects that repeated practices repeatedly enter into our lives (Painter 2006). Therefore, the everyday practices that construct the state, as lived, routine, daily, and quotidian, are also embodied practices (Mountz 2003; 2004), where "power is experienced close to the skin" (Aretxaga 2003: 396). Drawing on feminist understandings of embodiment (Hyndman 2001; Mountz 2003) redirects attention to the nooks and crannies of everyday life where state practices may lurk, away from obvious sites of power. Repeated and embodied practices by individuals construct the state; this includes

bureaucrats who enact state policies, but it also includes the lived practices of Alaskan residents for whom 'stateness' has infiltrated their everyday lives (Painter 2006). Everyday colonial state practices influenced intimate relationships in colonial Alaska, producing mixed-race children, and became manifested in elaborate projects of disease control. Assigning children to orphanages or adults to tuberculosis sanatoria is not a grand colonial plan, or federal policy; instead, these actions represent the routine, repeated, and embodied actions of individuals whose lives are colored by their connections to colonial state practices.

Haunting not only is *located* within the everyday practices of the colonial state, I argue, it also adds to our understanding of these practices. Haunting reinforces the materiality of everyday state practices: state practices of disease control, or effects on intimate relationships, as in colonial Alaska, have material consequences. These consequences—like the Qutekcak struggle for Federal recognition—*themselves* shape our understanding of the state. Haunting exemplifies how the effect of a coherent state becomes produced through everyday practices. As an analytic, haunting highlights the ordinary and routine points of connection between state imaginaries and state performances.

Secondly, haunting rejects the notion that the everyday implies timelessness. For many scholars (Jones and Merriman 2009; Painter 2006; Seigworth and Gardiner 2004), the everyday is an emancipatory concept because it represents a fleeting moment when anything is possible. These scholars (e.g. Jones and Merriman 2009; Secor 2007) employ the everyday to expose the "tentative and unstable" nature of sovereign power and propose opportunities for contestation (Hansen and Stepputat 2005: 3). Yet the potential of the

everyday cannot rest in its timelessness: haunting requires that the everyday be particular. Haunting redeploys the ghost with activity and effectiveness in the present. The state that becomes enacted at any given time and place draws on a specific long-term historical trajectory and context (Garmany 2009).

Finally, haunting expands on notions of everyday state practices by infusing it with the demand for justice. Specters such as those that erased the Qutekcak's colonial history from their struggle over sovereignty are not simply rhetorical flourishes or metaphorical connections: they represent the concern for justice for those who "*are not there,* of those who are no longer or who are not yet *present and living"* (italics in original, Derrida 1994: xviii). A concern for justice, in this case, does not mean finding a *collective* voice to attribute to Native Alaskans in Seward. Instead, justice requires locating and calling attention to the material injustices created by colonial practices, and recognizing the circumstances of their construction rather than taking them for granted.

The everyday practices of both the colonial and modern state in Alaska are constructed out of a history of injustice and unfulfilled promises. Like in other parts of the world, colonial state practices in Alaska were wrought with inherent contradiction, caught between the promises of equality under the law that accompanied the project of the modern state and the necessity of maintaining the difference between colonizer and colonized that underpinned the system of colonial rule (Chatterjee 1993). Wracked by contradictions, the colonial state could never fully fulfill or deny its implicit promises. Racialized hierarchies, violent 'civilizing' missions, and the interplay between difference and sameness are aspects of many colonial projects that resonate in Alaskan histories and struggles, and represent some of these inherent colonial contradictions (e.g. Sepez et al

2007). Haunting demonstrates that these types of underlying contradictions of colonial rule *continue*, perhaps strengthening over time, into the present-day, and into present-day, *everyday* state practices. Present-day state practices—such as the seven-part process through which the Qutekcak could become Federally recognized—carry with them contradictory and exclusionary histories.

If haunting emphasizes the materiality, adds to the particularity, and draws attention to the injustices within everyday state practices, what can everyday state practices add to haunting? Everyday practices pin the ghost firmly to the ground. Critics charge that the language used to describe the haunting and ghosts is often imprecise or vague (Cameron 2008). Ghosts lend themselves to discussion of concepts that are difficult to describe or identify (Edensor 2008; Holloway and Keane 2008) and historical moments that are painful to remember (Cameron 2008; Cho 2008; Gordon 2008). Rather than approaching ghosts as metaphorical, "unrepresentable" (Holloway and Kneale 2008) or "unidentifiable" (Edensor 2008) presences, the everyday state practices under investigation force ghosts into the open, allowing us to understand how 'the state' comes to be imagined as well as the very material effects this imagined entity produces. Alison Mountz (2010: 25) argues that researching the everyday interactions of the state allows researchers to "give up the ghostly for the mundane, the banal, the performative, and the prosaic." I suggest, however, that within the mundane, banal, and routinized practices of the state, we can find hauntings as well; we need not, perhaps, be so quick to "give up the ghostly" after all.

HAUNTING IN ALASKA

Framing the "seething presence" (Gordon 2008: 8) of the colonial state in the present-day struggle over Qutekcak recognition as haunting highlights several aspects of this process. First, haunting stresses the material effects—such as forced mobility, orphaned children, and tuberculosis—of everyday state practices. Colonial state projects consisted of larger state imaginaries, but tuberculosis, for example, connected these vast visions with ordinary Alaskans in devastating ways. Furthermore, the long-term trajectory of tuberculosis control not only affected patients and the composition of the Qutekcak Native tribal population, but *also* reaches forward to impact the struggles for sovereign recognition today. Tracing the malevolent, active, and purposeful path of colonial state practices demonstrates their continued influence in the present. The everyday state practices with which the Qutekcak engage as they struggle for sovereign recognition are shaped by patterns of disease and the territory's response: haunting begins to fill the gaps between how states are imagined and experienced.

Secondly, haunting suggests that the everyday is *not* timeless. To isolate the Qutekcak case *in time,* as investigations of the everyday (e.g. Bhatti et al 2009; Bissell 2009) have tended to do, obscures the need to situate the everyday in a specific historical context. The Qutekcak struggle today is fundamentally different because of the continued activity of the colonial state that haunts it. Colonial state practices influenced Native population movement on the peninsula, ensuring that just when the later law would require a continuous presence of Native residents, they would be absent. Everyday practices take place in specific moments, producing timely outcomes contingent on the geography and time in which they occurred. By following the path of a ghost through time, the specific

manner in which it alters future events can be traced. Haunting collapses time, bringing the past into and thereby permanently altering the present.

Finally, haunting adds to our understanding of everyday state practices by stressing the manifest injustice that occurs when state practices move through the bodies of Alaskan residents—in the birth of children or the contagion of disease—then continue to transform the lives of Alaskans today. The Qutekcak tribal members are themselves marked by the "seething presence" of colonialism even as they attempt to either adhere to or circumvent the U.S. tribal recognition criteria (Gordon 2008: 8). Within the colonial state, there existed a deep contradiction between the legal equality promised by Russian and American regimes and the essential differences between settlers and indigenous people maintained by the colonial state (Chatterjee 1993). This contradiction has continued. The promise of equal treatment under the law eludes the Qutekcak, whose colonial history prevents them from even entering the debate over their own sovereignty. The essential *difference* of the Qutekcak—their colonized past—prevents them from obtaining sovereign status, which would perhaps be the ultimate confirmation of that difference. Yet their difference *also* prevents the performance of sameness under the law. Caught between the promise of the modern state and the continued pull of the colonial project, the Qutekcak remain in limbo. The U.S. government has created contradictory circumstances that allow the Qutekcak tribe recognition only though methods that have already, in practical terms, prohibited the tribe from ever achieving it. By determining the framework for legitimacy, the U.S. government gives the tribe the opportunity for recognition. Yet the very *possibility* for incorporating the Qutekcak into the U.S. government's order of knowledge also silences the tribe. In the same moment, the U.S. creates and denies the very possibility of recognition. Haunted by its

colonial past, the U.S. state today is present for the Qutekcak tribe precisely in its absence, its non-recognition.

Employing haunting as an analytic to investigate everyday state practices builds on theories of a singular state constructed from everyday practices. Analysis of the everyday represents not only a methodology but also an epistemological claim: that the prosaic is itself a way of knowing—and contesting—the state (Gupta 2006; Mountz 2004; Painter 2006). The everyday must continually reinforce the material connections between the daily practices we perform and the visions of the state we eventually construct. Haunting foregrounds these connections, such as the diseases that connected colonial practices with current struggles for sovereign recognition.

Through this emphasis on the material connections between past and present, haunting contests the notion that the everyday represents any day, anywhere, at anytime. The point of everyday analysis must be its historically contingent position rather than its timelessness. As the example from Seward demonstrates, legacies of colonialism retain importance. Yet the introduction of these historical trajectories is not simply adding the past and stirring, but envisioning how material geographies of present-day Alaskan life are transformed through their encounters with the past. Contradictory ramifications of these transformations challenge a universal, monolithic understanding of 'the' state and 'the' colonial project as well, highlighting their ambiguities and complexities.

Haunting also importantly calls attention to issues of justice. It forces us to rethink the assumptions behind bureaucratic obstacles such as those faced by the Qutekcak tribe. Employing haunting to explain the continued presence of the colonial state in present-day Alaska does not promote a "fantasy" of postcolonial justice and reconciliation (Cameron

2008: 389), but rather disrupts the fantasy that justice and reconciliation *has already occurred*. The injustice faced by the Qutekcak is not—strictly speaking—the denial of federal recognition; it is instead the denial of the *opportunity* to achieve recognition *because of* colonial state practices. Striving for justice does not have to be a naïve or impossible goal: justice does not erase the past or gloss over present-day conflicts, but acknowledges the complex web of colonial legacies, appropriated identities, unfulfilled promises, and impossibly contradictory circumstances in which these events occur. Justice in this case requires taking ghosts into account, acting both "as a mode of memory and an avenue for ethical engagement with the present" (Cho 2008: 29).

A move towards justice may be occurring in Seward. In October 2011, the Tribal Administrator announced that lawyers for the Qutekcak tribe foresee achieving Federal recognition before 2013. Hope has spurred the Qutekcak tribal administration into new and urgent activity: enrolling and documenting tribal members, fine-tuning the tribal constitution, and increasing member participation in local governance issues (Allen 2010). Such actions may begin to outline a more ethical engagement with the present, which Tammy Clewell (2002: 132) writes, is "a work of rebuilding interior and exterior dwelling places worthy of human habitation." The project of rebuilding dwelling places is partially one of bringing together seemingly unrelated events—attempts to gain sovereign status and territorial disease control—and understand each as a different, but related circumstance of the colonial state *haunting* the present-day. The ability to see these initially unrelated instances as elements of a larger framework is what I refer to as a *spectral geography*. It is as if each element haunted by the ghost of the colonial state becomes tinged with a particular color, visible and clearly highlighted only once one gazes through a

particular lens. Haunting is that lens, that analytic. What it reveals are the connections: together, this particular spectral geography reveals how ghosts reinvigorate aspects of the colonial state and manifest themselves in the everyday spaces of the present-day.

Spectral geographies are useful for making connections across places and times, highlighting struggles for justice that counteract the effectiveness of ghosts in the present. If we ignore hauntings when they demand our attention, we risk perpetrating a "nightmarish repetition of the past," which becomes both familiar and strange (Brogan 1995: 155). Haunting traces of colonial state practices, recognizable yet hidden, mar the smooth potential of the present with the seething presence of the past.

Works Cited

Abrams, P. (2006) Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State, in Sharma, A. and Gupta, A. (eds.) *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*. Malden, MA, Blackwell, pp. 112-130.

Agnew, J. (2005) Sovereignty regimes: Territoriality and state authority in contemporary world politics, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 95: 437-461.

Alaska Division of Commerce. (2003). Overview of Government in Alaska. http://www.commerce.state.ak.us/dca/LOGON/muni/muni-govtoverview.htm, Accessed January 7, 2011.

Alaska History. (2010) Alaska's Heritage: Chapter 4-21: health and medicine. www.akhistorycourse.org. Accessed September 10, 2010.

Allen, S. (2010). NOW is the time to get involved! *The Wave*, *24*(5).

Allen, S. (2011). From Your Tribal Administrator. *The Wave*, *26*(1).

Aretxaga, B. (2003) Maddening States, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 32: 393-410.

Barry, M. J. (1995) *Seward, Alaska: A History, Vol. III: 1924-1994. Growth, Tragedy, Recovery, Adaptation.* Anchorage, AK: MJP BARRY

Bhatti, M., Church, A., Claremont, A. and Stenner, P. (2009) 'I love being in the garden': enchanting encounters in everyday life, *Social and Cultural Geography* 10: 61-76.

Bissell, D. (2009) Visualizing everyday geographies: practices of vision through travel-time, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 34: 42-60.

Braun, B. (2002) *The Intemperate Rainforest: Nature, Culture, and Power on Canada's West Coast.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Brogan, K. (1995) American Stories of Cultural Haunting: Tales of Heirs and Ethnographers. *College English* 57: 149-165.

Cameron, E. (2008) Indigenous spectrality and the politics of postcolonial ghost stories, *Cultural Geographies* 15: 383-393.

Chatterjee, P. (1993) *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Cho, G. (2008) *Haunting and the Korean Diaspora: Shame, Secrecy and the Forgotten War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Chugachmuit (2008) Qutekcak Native Tribe, http://www.chugachmiut.org/ Accessed 15 October.

Clewell, T. (2002) From Destructive to Constructive Haunting in Toni Morrison's Paradise, *West Coast Line* 37: 130-142.

Comaroff, J. (2007) Ghostly topographies: landscape and biopower in modern Singapore, *Cultural Geographies* 14: 56-73.

Cook, S. F. (1973) The significance of disease in the extinction of the New England Indians, *Human Biology* 45: 485-508.

Crowell, A. L., & Mann, D. H. (1998). *Archaeology and Coastal Dynamics of Kenai Fjords National Park, Alaska.* Anchorage: National Park Service, Alaska Region.

Crowell A. L., Yesner, D. R., Eagle, R., and Hanson, D. K. (2008) An Historic Alutiiq Village on the Outer Kenai Coast: Subsistence and Trade in the Early Russian Contact Period, *Alaska Journal of Anthropology* 6: 1-20.

Derrida, J. (1994) *Specters of Marx: the State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*. New York and London: Routledge

Dyck, I. (2005) Feminist geography, the 'everyday', and local-global relations: hidden spaces of place-making, *Canadian Geographer* 49: 233-244.

Edensor, T. (2008) Mundane hauntings: commuting through the phantasmagoric working-class spaces of Manchester, England, *Cultural Geographies* 15: 313-333.

Ferguson, J. (2006) The Anti-Politics Machine, in Sharma, A. and Gupta, A. (eds.) *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 270-286.

Fortuine, R. (2005) *Must we all die? Alaska's enduring struggle with tuberculosis.* Fairbanks: University of Alaska Press

Fraser, A. (2007). Land reform in South Africa and the colonial present. *Social and Cultural Geography*, *8*(6), 835-851.

Garmany, J. (2009) The Embodied State: Governmentality in a Brazilian Favela, *Social and Cultural Geography* 10: 721-739.

Gordon, A. (2008). *Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination.* Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Gregg, M. (2004) A Mundane Voice, *Cultural Studies* 18: 363-383.

Gregory, D. (2004) *The Colonial Present: Afghanistan, Palestine, Iraq*. Malden, MA: Blackwell

Gupta, A. (2006) Blurred Boundaries: The Discourse of Corruption, the Culture of Politics, and the Imagined State. In Sharma, A. and Gupta, A. (eds.) *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 211-242.

Hamidi, A. (2009) Inscriptions of Violence in Northern Yemen: Haunting Histories, Unstable Moral Spaces, *Middle Eastern Studies* 45: 165-187.

Hansen, T. B. and Stepputat, F. (eds.) (2005) *Sovereign Bodies: Citizens, Migrants, and States in the Postcolonial World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Haycox, S. (2002) *Alaska: An American Colony*. Seattle: University of Washington Press

Holloway, J. and Kneale, J. (2008) Locating haunting: a ghost-hunter's guide, *Cultural*

Geographies 15: 297-312.

Hyndman, J. (2001) Towards a Feminist Geopolitics. *The Canadian Geographer* 45: 210-222.

Jansson, D. R. (2007) The Haunting of the South: American Geopolitical Identity and the Burden of Southern History, *Geopolitics* 12: 400-425.

Jones, R. and Merriman, P. (2009) Hot, banal and everyday nationalism: Bilingual road signs in Wales, *Political Geography* 28: 164-173.

Kearney, A., & Bradley, J. (2009). 'Too strong to every not be there': Place names and emotional geographies. *Social and Cultural Geography*, *10*(1), 77-94.

Kenai Peninsula Borough (2008) Resolution 2008-064: A Resolution Supporting the Qutekcak Native Tribe's Federal Recognition Efforts. Soldotna, AK

Lloyd, T. (2008) Thuggee, marginality and the state effect in colonial India, circa 1770-1840, *Indian Economic Social History Review* 45: 201-237.

Luckhurst, R. (2003) Traumaculture, *New Formations* 50: 28-47.

Maddern, J. F. and Adey, P. (2008) Editorial: spectro-geographies, *Cultural Geographies* 15: 291-295.

Manderson, L. (1999) Public Health Developments in Colonial Malaya: Colonialism and the Politics of Prevention, *American Journal of Public Health* 89: 102-107.

McEwan, C. (2008) A very modern ghost: postcolonialism and the politics of enchantment, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26: 29-46.

Mountz, A. (2003) Human Smuggling, the Transnational Imaginary, and Everyday Geographies of the Nation-State, *Antipode* 35: 622-644.

Mountz, A. (2004) Embodying the Nation-State: Canada's Response to Human Smuggling, *Political Geography* 23: 323-345.

Mountz, A. (2010) *Seeking Asylum: Human Smuggling and Bureaucracy at the Border*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Murphy, M. (2005) The Bureau of Indian Affairs' Process for Recognizing Groups as Indian Tribes Congressional Research Service. Washington DC: The Library of Congress

Nally, D. (2008) 'That Coming Storm': the Irish Poor Law, Colonial Biopolitics, and the Great Famine, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 98: 714-741.

Nazzaro, R. (2006) Indian Issues: Testimony Before the Committee on Resources House of Representatives. Washington DC: United States Government Accountability Office

Ongtooguk, P. (2004). The Annotated ANCSA. http://www.alaskool.org/projects/ancsa/annancsa.htm, Accessed January 7, 2011.

Painter, J. (2006) Prosaic geographies of stateness, *Political Geography* 25: 752-774.

Peck, J. (2003) Geography and public policy: Mapping the penal state, *Progress in Human Geography* 27: 222-232.

Power, M., & Sidaway, J. (2005). Deconstructing twinned towers: Lisbon's Expo '98 and the occluded geographies of discovery. *Social and Cultural Geography*, *6*(6), 865-883.

Qutekcak Elders Group (2008) Interview. Seward, AK

Qutekcak Native Tribe (2010) Federal Recogntion. http://sewardaknatives.com/ Accessed September 10 2010

Secor, A. J. (2007) Between longing and despair: state, space, and subjectivity in Turkey, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 25: 33-52.

Seigworth, G. J. and Gardiner, M. E. (2004) Rethinking everyday life. *Cultural Studies* 18: 139-159.

Sepez, J., Package, C., Malcolm, P. E. and Poole, A. (2007) Unalaska, Alaska: memory and

denial in the globalization of the Aleutian landscape, *Polar Geography* 30: 193-209.

Seward City News (2007) City Council Action Agenda. sewardcitynews.com/ Accessed September 10 2010.

Sidaway, J. D. (2000) Postcolonial Geographies: An Exploratory Essay, *Progress in Human Geography* 24: 591-612.

Smiley, S. L. (2010). Expatriate everyday life in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: Colonial origins and contemporary legacies. *Social and Cultural Geography*, *11*(4), 327-342.

Smith, D. (1987) *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press

Stanek, R. T. (1998). Ethnographic Overview and Assessment for Port Graham and Nanwalek.

Stoler, A. (2008) Imperial Debris: Reflections on Ruins and Ruination, *Cultural Anthropology* 23: 191-219.

Thrift, N. (2004) Electric Animals, *Cultural Studies* 18: 461-482.

The Wave (2009) Federal Recognition, *The Wave* 20:2

Wylie, J. (2009) Landscape, Absence and the Geographies of Love, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 34: 275-289.

Young, D. (1998) Qutekcak Native Tribe Recognition Act H. R. 4693: To provide for Federal recognition of the Qutekcak Native Tribe of Alaska and the Tuscarora Nation of the Kau-ta-Noh, and for other purposes. House of Representatives. Washington DC